

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,794	05/02/2001	Jackie L. Huffman	8830 4912	
26884	7590 11/22/200	•	EXAMINER	
PAUL W. MARTIN		JARRETT, SCOTT L		
NCR CORPORATION, LAW DEPT. 1700 S. PATTERSON BLVD.		1.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	OH 45479-0001		3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

. ma\ .	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Advisory Action	09/847,794	HUFFMAN, JACKIE	L.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Scott L. Jarrett	3623		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	 ress	
THE REPLY FILED 09 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		•		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on			indonment of	
this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in (idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	-			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.				
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	Ò6.07(f).			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The approprinally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ice action; or (2) as	
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th		
AMENDMENTS				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, They raise new issues that would require further co They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) 	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying	the issues for	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		empliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the	
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		II be entered and an e	explanation of	
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-18.				
Claim(s) rejected. 1-10. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attack	hed.	
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:	
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)	160	
13. Other:	S	NO(S) MANNA M. DIAZ MARY EXAMINER	TUZ	
		44 3623		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

In applicant's remarks dated November 9, 2005 applicant argues that the prior art of record, specifcally Nashner does not disclose or teach displaying performance targets/goals prior to and during a training session. Applicant states that Nashner "merely discloses a general principle of eduction that a trainee striving to achieve a clearly defined objective goal whil receiving periodic feedback is the best motivated."

With respect to the applicant's assertion that the prior art of record does not teach displaying performance targets/goals prior to and during a training session (Remarks Paragraph 1, Page 12) the examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner agrees with the applicant and Nashner that providing goals to trainees (operators, users, students, workers, etc.) so that they know what is expected of them (i.e. prior to performing the expected work/task) and know how they are doing in reference to those expectations/goals (i.e. providing performance feedback during and after the completion of the expected work/task) is an old and very well known training/motivational principle utilized by any number of performance feedback systems and methods. Further Nashner teaches the creation of individualized performance (training) programs for individual users wherein individual performance goals (benchmarks, prescribed goals, etc.) are set for each user (subject, operator, etc.; Column 4, Lines 43-60; Column 5, Lines 40-44; Figure 1) based on the individual's and/or group's historical performance (Abstract; Column 4, Lines 18-27).

Additionally it is noted that the prior art of record does teach determining and displaying cashier performance performance feedback as evideneced by at least the following references cited in the office action dated September 16, 2005:

- Larson, John, U.S. Patent No. 3,899,775, teaches a system and method for managing and monitoring retail transactions as part of a point-of-sale system. Larson further teaches that such systems "are capable of producing a variety of management reports on items such as inventory, sales rates and checker productivity."
- Collins, Donald, U.S. Patent No. 5,44,226, teaches a system and method for providing real-time scanning performance feedback to a cashier at a point-of-sale terminal.
- Zimmerman, Dennis, Nieman set to expand computer-based training, teaches the utilization of cashier performance feedback systems and methods for providing performance feedback to cashiers at a point-of-sale terminal wherein a plurality of performance metrics are measured and reported/displayed including but not limited to scanning speed and scan rate.
- Closing in on front-end shrink teaches the commercial availability and public use of systems and methods for monitoring the performance of cashiers in a point-of-sale system. The article further teaches the commercial availability of a cashier performance monitoring system and method by Trax Software.

Further it is noted that the amended claims 1-18 would be rejected using the similar art and rationale as discussed in the Final Office Action dated September 16, 2005.